arXiv:nlin/0111060v1 [nlin.SI] 28 Nov 2001

Singularity analysis of a new discrete nonlinear Schrödinger equation

S. Yu. Sakovich

Institute of Physics, National Academy of Sciences, 220072 Minsk, Belarus
E-mail: saks@pisem.net

Abstract

We apply the Painlevé test for integrability to the new discrete nonlinear Schrödinger equation introduced by Leon and Manna. Since the singular expansions of solutions of this equation turn out to contain non-dominant logarithmic terms, we conclude that the studied equation is nonintegrable. This result supports the recent observation of Levi and Yamilov that the Leon–Manna equation does not admit high-order generalized symmetries.

PACS numbers: 02.30.Ik, 02.30.Hq

Recently, Leon and Manna [1] introduced the following new discrete nonlinear Schrödinger equation:

$$\alpha\psi_{m,tt} = \mathrm{i}\beta\left(\psi_{m+1} - \psi_{m-1}\right) + 2\left|\psi_m\right|^2\psi_m \tag{1}$$

where α and β are nonzero real parameters, $m = 0, \pm 1, \pm 2, \dots$. In [1], the equation (1) was derived from the integrable Toda lattice equation through the reductive perturbation analysis. More recently, Levi and Yamilov [2] studied the integrability of (1) by means of the generalized symmetry analysis, and found that the equation (1) does not admit local generalized symmetries of order higher than three and, hence, does not possess the same integrability properties as the Toda lattice equation, from which it has been derived.

In the present short note, we study the integrability of the Leon–Manna equation (1) by means of the Painlevé test, following the Ablowitz–Ramani–Segur algorithm of singularity analysis [3] (see also [4]). We find the presence of non-dominant logarithmic terms in the singular expansions of solutions of (1). This brings us to the same conclusion as made in [2]: the new discrete nonlinear Schrödinger equation must be nonintegrable.

Following [2], we study (1) in its equivalent form:

$$\begin{aligned} & u_{m,tt} - u_m^2 v_m - u_{m+1} + u_{m-1} = 0 \\ & v_{m,tt} - v_m^2 u_m + v_{m+1} - v_{m-1} = 0 \end{aligned} \tag{2}$$

$m = 0, \pm 1, \pm 2, \ldots$, where u_m and v_m stand for ψ_m and $\bar{\psi}_m$, and a complex-valued scale transformation of variables has been made. From the standpoint of singularity analysis, the equation (2) is an infinite system of second-order nonlinear ordinary differential equations, which admits infinitely many branches of the dominant behavior of solutions, i.e. the choices of constants $\alpha_m, \beta_m, u_{m,0}, v_{m,0}$ in $u_m = u_{m,0}\phi^{\alpha_m} + \cdots$ and $v_m = v_{m,0}\phi^{\beta_m} + \cdots$, where $m = 0, \pm 1, \pm 2, \ldots$ and $\phi_t = 1$. We will analyze only one of those branches, namely,

$$\alpha_m = \beta_m = -1 \qquad u_{m,0} v_{m,0} = 2 \qquad m = 0, \pm 1, \pm 2, \ldots . \tag{3}$$

Using the expansions

$$\begin{aligned} & u_m = u_{m,0}\phi^{-1} + \cdots + u_{m,r_m}\phi^{r_m - 1} + \cdots \\ & v_m = v_{m,0}\phi^{-1} + \cdots + v_{m,r_m}\phi^{r_m - 1} + \cdots \end{aligned} \tag{4}$$

with $u_{m,0} v_{m,0} = 2$, we find from (2) that the positions of resonances are $r_m = -1, 0, 3, 4$, for all m, $m = 0, \pm 1, \pm 2, \ldots$. This means that the branch (3) is non-generic: since the resonance -1 corresponds to the arbitrariness of the constant in $\phi = t + \text{constant}$, the expansions (4) contain at most $3N + 1$ arbitrary constants for a subsystem of $2N$ equations (say, with $m = 1, \ldots, N$) of the infinite system (2), not $4N$ arbitrary constants as should be for the general solution due to the Cauchy theorem. Though the branch (3) represents only a class of special solutions, its analysis is sufficient for reaching the conclusion that the system (2) does not pass the Painlevé test for integrability.

Assuming that the solutions of (2) are represented in the case of (3) by the Laurent type expansions

$$u_m = \sum_{i=0}^{\infty} u_{m,i}\phi^{i-1} \qquad v_m = \sum_{i=0}^{\infty} v_{m,i}\phi^{i-1} \tag{5}$$

we find the following recursion relations for the constant coefficients $u_{m,n}$ and

$v_{m,n}$, $m = 0, \pm 1, \pm 2, \ldots$, $n = 0, 1, 2, \ldots$:

$$\begin{aligned}(n-1)(n-2)\, u_{m,n} - \sum_{i=0}^{n}\sum_{j=0}^{n-i} u_{m,i} u_{m,j} v_{m,n-i-j} + u_{m-1,n-2} \\ - u_{m+1,n-2} = 0 \\ (n-1)(n-2)\, v_{m,n} - \sum_{i=0}^{n}\sum_{j=0}^{n-i} v_{m,i} v_{m,j} u_{m,n-i-j} + v_{m+1,n-2} \\ - v_{m-1,n-2} = 0\end{aligned} \tag{6}$$

where $u_{m,-2} = v_{m,-2} = u_{m,-1} = v_{m,-1} = 0$ formally.

Now we have to check whether the recursion relations (6) are consistent at the resonances or not. At $n = 0$, we have $u_{m,0} = 2/v_{m,0}$ with arbitrary nonzero constants $v_{m,0}$, $m = 0, \pm 1, \pm 2, \ldots$, and no compatibility conditions arise. Then we find

$$u_{m,1} = v_{m,1} = 0 \tag{7}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}u_{m,2} &= \frac{2}{3v_{m-1,0}} - \frac{2}{3v_{m+1,0}} + \frac{v_{m-1,0} - v_{m+1,0}}{3v_{m,0}^2} \\ v_{m,2} &= \frac{v_{m,0}^2}{6v_{m+1,0}} - \frac{v_{m,0}^2}{6v_{m-1,0}} + \frac{v_{m+1,0} - v_{m-1,0}}{3}\end{aligned} \tag{8}$$

from (6) at $n = 1$ and $n = 2$, respectively; $m = 0, \pm 1, \pm 2, \ldots$. At the resonance $n = 3$, we obtain

$$v_{m,3} = -\frac{1}{2} v_{m,0}^2 u_{m,3} \tag{9}$$

where $u_{m,3}$ are arbitrary constants, $m = 0, \pm 1, \pm 2, \ldots$, and no compatibility conditions arise again. At the highest resonance, $n = 4$, however, the recursion relations (6) fail to be consistent, and the infinite set of compatibility conditions

$$\begin{aligned}&\frac{v_{m-1,0}^2}{v_{m,0} v_{m-2,0}} + \frac{2v_{m,0}}{v_{m-2,0}} + \frac{2v_{m-2,0}}{v_{m,0}} + \frac{v_{m,0} v_{m-2,0}}{v_{m-1,0}^2} \\ &+ \frac{v_{m+1,0}^2}{v_{m,0} v_{m+2,0}} + \frac{2v_{m,0}}{v_{m+2,0}} + \frac{2v_{m+2,0}}{v_{m,0}} + \frac{v_{m,0} v_{m+2,0}}{v_{m+1,0}^2} \\ &- \frac{2v_{m,0}^2}{v_{m-1,0} v_{m+1,0}} - \frac{4v_{m-1,0}}{v_{m+1,0}} - \frac{4v_{m+1,0}}{v_{m-1,0}} - \frac{2v_{m-1,0} v_{m+1,0}}{v_{m,0}^2} = 0\end{aligned} \tag{10}$$

arises there for the infinite set of constants $v_{m,0}$, $m = 0, \pm 1, \pm 2, \ldots$.

Since we obtained the nontrivial compatibility conditions (10), we have to modify the singular expansions (5) by introducing appropriate logarithmic terms, starting from the terms proportional to $\phi^3 \log \phi$ [4]. The appearance of such logarithmic terms, however, is generally believed to be a clear symptom of nonintegrability [4], [5]. For this reason, we conclude that the Leon–Manna equation (1) should not be expected to be integrable.

References

[1] Leon J and Manna M 1999 Multiscale analysis of discrete nonlinear evolution equations *J. Phys. A: Math. Gen.* **32** 2845–69

[2] Levi D and Yamilov R 2001 On the integrability of a new discrete nonlinear Schrödinger equation *J. Phys. A: Math. Gen.* **34** L553–62

[3] Ablowitz M J, Ramani A and Segur H 1980 A connection between nonlinear evolution equations and ordinary differential equations of P-type. I *J. Math. Phys.* **21** 715–21

[4] Ramani A, Grammaticos B and Bountis T 1989 The Painlevé property and singularity analysis of integrable and non-integrable systems *Phys. Rep.* **180** 159–245

[5] Ablowitz M J and Clarkson P A 1991 *Solitons, Nonlinear Evolution Equations and Inverse Scattering* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press)